United Nations A/CN.10/PV.338

General Assembly

Official Records

Disarmament Commission

338th meeting

Monday, 7 April 2014, 3 p.m.

New York

Chair: Mr. Drobnjak ..... (Croatia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

General debate (*continued*)

Mrs. Perceval (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me first, on behalf of my delegation, to congratulate and pay tribute to you, Sir, on your election to chair the work of the Disarmament Commission. I also congratulate the other members of the Bureau. I would also take this opportunity to thank Mr. Christopher Grima, Ambassador of Malta, for his efforts during the previous session. With his ability and diplomatic experience, he laid the foundations for this substantive session. I would also like to thank Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative of the Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for her presence and statement and her entire team for its work and dedication.

The delegation of Argentina fully associates itself with the statement made by Ambassador Saul Weisleder, Deputy Permanent Representative of Costa Rica, on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (see A/CN.10/PV.337). My delegation wishes very briefly to contribute some elements to our discussions today.

As we stated in previous substantive sessions, we should be able to identify measures that allow us to make progress in complete and verifiable nuclear disarmament and build confidence with respect to the goals of transparency, cooperation and peace that motivate all of us without exception.

The Disarmament Commission has not been immune to the crisis in the disarmament machinery. However, the deliberative nature of the Commission makes it the context where we can contribute to breaking the deadlock that has lasted for more than a decade. In that regard, we emphasize the value of dialogue in the framework of the Commission beyond the recommendations that it can agree upon at the end of the present substantive session.

For Argentina, the Disarmament Commission provides a forum of interest that should be maintained and substantively revived. We suggest the desirability of agreeing to a limited number of topics for the next cycle to facilitate new understandings and consensus among Member States.

In conclusion, we call on all delegations to join forces and adopt a pragmatic approach in order to have a fruitful session of the Commission. To that end, Mr. Chair, you can count on the full cooperation of the delegation of Argentina.

Mr. Masood Khan (Pakistan): We congratulate you, Sir, on your election as the Chair of the Disarmament Commission for this year. On behalf of the Pakistan delegation, I assure you, Sir, and the newly elected Bureau, of our full support and cooperation. We are confident that, with your drive and leadership, the Commission should be able to cover new ground.

We associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (see A/CN.10/PV.337). We also thank Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson for his insightful opening statement.

Today, global security is in flux. Turbulence has erupted in new countries and regions, with devastating

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

14-29204 (E)

Accessible document Please recycle

impact, even as we deal with the consequences of chronic conflicts. Old disputes continue to fester. New challenges, ranging from space to cyberspace to the use of lethal armed robotics and armed drones, loom large on the horizon. The deadliest weapons of mass destruction and the unbridled build-up of conventional arms jeopardize the security of us all. Yet consensus on the disarmament agenda is elusive and fragile.

There is a compelling need to rebuild global agreement on the disarmament agenda. We believe that the best way to do that is to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, with the aim of coming up with an integrated approach to achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in a balanced and non-discriminatory manner, keeping in view the security interests of all States. For years, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has been calling for convening such a session.

For almost a decade now, Pakistan has been advocating the renewal and reconstruction of the international consensus on disarmament issues. In his address during the substantive segment of the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament last year, Prime Minister Muhammad Nawaz Sharif called for exploring common ground to revive and restore our collective agreement and build a new consensus on disarmament and non-proliferation.

Rebuilding that consensus is not going to be easy, given the interplay of competing perceptions, interests and approaches. However, it is becoming imperative for the Disarmament Commission, as a deliberative body with universal membership, to give a fresh impetus to such an exercise. Let me outline the factors influencing such an agreement.

First, consensus-building must proceed from the universally recognized premise that security is indivisible and based on the right of all States to equal security, both in the non-conventional and conventional fields, and at regional and international levels.

Secondly, we must clearly understand that there are at least three drivers for the acquisition of weapons — perceived threats from superior conventional or non-conventional forces, disputes and conflicts with more powerful States, and discrimination in the application of international norms and laws.

Thirdly, an agreed criteria-based and non-discriminatory approach must be developed for the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy under appropriate international safeguards, in accordance with the international obligations of States.

Fourthly, concerns arising from the development, deployment and proliferation of anti-ballistic missile systems need to be addressed by means of legal instruments.

Fifthly, development and the use of armed drones and lethal autonomous robots must strictly conform to international law.

To bolster consensus, progress is required on all four core issues of the disarmament agenda. There should be a renewed commitment to achieving nuclear disarmament within a reasonable time frame; without that commitment, the bargain underlying the non-proliferation regime will continue to erode. Until nuclear disarmament is achieved, non-nuclear weapon States should be given assurances through a universal and legally binding treaty that they will not be subject to the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. The international legal regime must be strengthened in order to prevent the militarization of outer space. Finally, a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) should be conceived and negotiated as an integral part of the overall disarmament agenda, with the genuine desire to ensure equal security for all, on a non-discriminatory basis. A lopsided, unifocal pursuit of an FMCT, driven by a non-proliferation prism while soft-pedaling other core issues or relegating them to a back-burner, has not succeeded in the past; it is not going to work in the future either.

Pakistan welcomes the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty as a first step towards a more responsible transfer of arms and a means of reducing human suffering without having an impact on the self-defence needs of States. Pakistan calls for the next step of promoting conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels, legal restraints on excessive production of such arms and balanced reduction in conventional forces and armaments.

Pakistan supports the development of confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms. We have contributed constructively to the deliberations on that aspect in the past decade. We look forward to the Commission's proceedings on that important issue this year.

Pakistan's approach to nuclear disarmament is determined by the guiding principles of the first

special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which uphold the right of each State to undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments and military force. As Prime Minister Sharif told the General Assembly last year: "This means security for all; not security of a privileged few."

Guided by the principles of restraint and responsibility, we will continue to adhere to our policy of credible minimal deterrence. We do not want an arms race in South Asia, but we are fully attentive to the emerging security dynamics. Our deterrence will remain symmetric and credible.

Meanwhile, Pakistan will continue to pursue its policy of a strategic restraint regime, which includes nuclear restraint, conventional balance and conflict resolution. In the past, we have engaged India to work on confidence-building and nuclear risk reduction through a series of measures covering communications, pre-notification of missile flight tests and accidents. We believe that the introduction of a ballistic missile defence system in South Asia will be an escalatory and destabilizing step.

We call upon the international community to reverse discrimination and enable Pakistan to have full access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Pakistan needs that technology to produce more nuclear energy to redress its growing electricity deficit. We also call for Pakistan to be a member of export control regimes, especially the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

The so-called deadlock afflicting the disarmament machinery does not arise from the way it conducts its business. There is nothing wrong with the disarmament machinery, the rules of procedures or the working methods. The same institutions, rules and methods in the past produced the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and guidelines for nuclear-weapon-free zones and international arms transfers. The real challenge lies with the international strategic and political environment as perceived in capitals. What we need is the political will and due diligence, especially by major Powers, and not attempts to rewrite the rules of procedure or reconfigure the disarmament machinery.

Mr. Lasso Mendoza (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): First, my delegation congratulates you on your election, Mr. Chair, and the members of the Bureau. We also congratulate the Chairs of the Working Groups on their appointments. At the same time, I would like to reiterate my delegation's appreciation to Ambassador Grima of Malta and Ambassador Roman-Morey of Peru, former Chairs of the Commission in the three-year cycle that is coming to an end this year.

The delegation of Ecuador aligns itself with the statements made by the representative of Costa Rica on behalf of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States and the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/CN.10/PV.337).

Ecuador was the first country in the world to recognize in its Constitution nature's rights for its existence, maintenance, structures, functions and evolutionary processes and the regeneration of its vital cycles to be subject to less human aggression. The Ecuadorian Constitution also declares the country's territory a zone of peace so as to ensure that its citizens lived in a healthy environment. In that context, Ecuador condemns the very existence of weapons of mass destruction on the face of the Earth and believes that their use or threat of use constitute a crime against nature and against humankind itself.

Like many other States, as demonstrated by the successful General Assembly High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament (see A/68/PV.11), held in September 2013, Ecuador believes that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation should be simultaneous, interrelated and confluent processes. My country, a State that does not possess nuclear weapons, has and will continue to comply with its international obligations on nuclear non-proliferation. We continue to hope that nuclear-weapon States will fulfil their commitments on nuclear disarmament. However, Ecuador is dismayed that there is still no compliance with that obligation to date.

Ecuador believes that it is time that the international community put into practice the priority attached to nuclear disarmament and start negotiating a legally binding and universal treaty banning the development, possession and use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, my delegation hopes for the prompt establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in regions where such zones do not yet exist, in accordance with the principles adopted by consensus by the Disarmament Commission itself in 1999. I would recall that the relevant working group was chaired by Ecuador. In that way, we would take substantial steps in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. In that

regard, my delegation regrets that the conference on the creation of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East has not yet been convened, as it should have already taken place in 2012. We call on the organizers to convene it in order to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East as soon as possible.

Ecuador also believes the agenda item on practical measures for confidence-building in the field of conventional weapons to be relevant. That topic is crucial for Ecuador, as such measures provide important support to peace, security and stability, in particular at the regional, subregional and bilateral levels. Furthermore, we believe that such measures are best and most fully expressed at those levels, notwithstanding the progress that can be made on them in the multilateral arena.

In that vein, Ecuador, together with the other countries of the Union of South American Nations, has been promoting confidence-building measures, in particular in the following categories: information exchange and transparency, in terms of both defence systems and defence spending; notification of military activities; measures in the field of security; guarantees; and compliance and verification measures. That process is still in its initial stages, but it is gaining momentum by the day and has the support of all countries in the South American region, including, of course, Ecuador.

In that respect, we believe that anti-personnel mines and cluster munitions are a threat to innocent civilians. Therefore my country is a party to the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions, which ban such weapons. Consistent with that, as a practical example of the implementation of measures to promote confidence at the bilateral level, Ecuador, along with its neighbour Peru, has embarked upon a successful humanitarian mine-clearance process along our common border, which we expect to be completed in October 2017. During the visit to my country by His Royal Highness Prince Mired Raad Al-Hussein, Special Envoy on the Universalization of the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, that urgent effort was recognized.

Trust is built, among other things, on the basis of an appropriate balance of rights and obligations among States, always in the context of the principles and rights enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. Ecuador has always respected the principles of the sovereign equality of States, non-intereference in the internal affairs of other States, political sovereignty, territorial integrity, self-determination and the right to self-defence.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its full commitment to the decisions and agreements reached in the context of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. By the same token, we also express our full support for the United Nations Disarmament Commission as the deliberative organ of the Organization's disarmament machinery, whose function is to consider and make recommendations on the various issues in the area of disarmament, as well as for the Conference on Disarmament as the sole negotiating body in that area.

In that context, we express our hope that all States will show sufficient political will so as to reach agreement on the recommendations under both agenda items for submission to the General Assembly. My delegation will devote its utmost efforts and capitalize on its conviction in order to achieve that goal.

Mr. Haniff (Malaysia): Malaysia extends its warm congratulations to you, Mr. Chair, as Permanent Representative of Croatia on your assumption of the chairmanship of the 2014 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC). Allow me also to congratulate the other Bureau members, as well as the Chairs of the respective Working Groups, Ambassador Naif bin Bandar Al-Sudairy of Saudi Arabia and Mr. Knut Langeland of Norway, on their elections. I would also like to thank Ambassador Christopher Grima of Malta for his contribution and constructive efforts as Chair of the Disarmament Commission last year.

Malaysia associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/CN.10/PV.337).

Malaysia reaffirms the continuing relevance of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized body with universal membership in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. The UNDC provides a comprehensive and deliberative approach, which is important in order to achieve an outcome that enjoys the broadest possible support. As such, my delegation welcomes the progress made at the 2013 substantive session of the UNDC, where for the first time in eight years we were able to send forward three working

papers as a starting point for the final session of the current cycle.

Now that the stage has been set for this year, we should capitalize on that momentum and fulfil our collective responsibility by adopting recommendations that lead towards general and complete disarmament. Malaysia reiterates its call for all parties to renew their commitment to that process and to demonstrate the necessary flexibility, compromise and political will in order to come up with a successful substantive outcome.

In three weeks' time, many of us here will participate in the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to be held here in New York. Malaysia is of the view that this year's Preparatory Committee session should continue the momentum towards greater cooperation on achieving the NPT's objectives on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, bearing in mind the targets that we agreed upon in the action plan of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

In achieving a world free of nuclear weapons, Malaysia is of the view that all parties should heed the obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion the negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control, as reflected in the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice (A/51/218, annex). That was also espoused by The Honourable Dato' Sri Mohd. Najib bin Tun Abdul Razak, Prime Minister of Malaysia, in his remarks during the first ever General Assemably High-level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament, held last year. Through that landmark event and the pronouncements of many of our leaders, it is clear that nuclear disarmament remains the highest priority of the international community.

My delegation is also heartened by the growing interest of Member States in a humanitarian approach to the consequences of nuclear weapons. In that regard, we congratulate Mexico on the successful hosting of the second International Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, held on 13 and 14 February. We look forward to further progress on that matter during the next conference, to be hosted by Austria.

Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, my delegation reiterates its call for the urgent conclusion of a universal, unconditional, non-discriminatory and legally binding instrument on negative security assurances. We also remain concerned about the lack of progress on the reduction of strategic and non-strategic nuclear weapons, and we are deeply disturbed about on the modernization and upgrading of nuclear arsenals by nuclear-weapon States.

Turning to nuclear-weapon-free zones, my delegation is deeply disappointed about the continued failure to convene the conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Like many others, last year we anticipated that such delay would have serious implications in the run-up to the 2015 NPT Review Conference. Unfortunately, that prediction has turned out to be correct. Malaysia therefore strongly urges the Secretary-General, as well as the States concerned, to convene the conference without any further delay and with the active participation of all States in the region so as to avoid any further possible negative repercussions for the credibility of the Treaty itself. All States should approach the conference with an open mind on, and without prejudice to, the various security concerns of others.

Malaysia continues to believe that such zones contribute significantly to global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. In that connection, my delegation also looks forward to the conclusion of negotiations between the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the five nuclear-weapon States on the Protocol to the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone. We hope that the nuclear-weapon States will commit to the signing of the Protocol to the Treaty and its related documents at the earliest possible opportunity.

With regard to conventional weapons, Malaysia welcomes the adoption by the General Assembly of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). We subsequently joined the ranks of signatory States to the ATT on 26 September 2013. Malaysia has always supported the ATT process. While recognizing that, although the Treaty may not satisfy all the concerns of all States, we are convinced that it will develop and evolve into a common understanding.

Malaysia will continue to support confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons at all levels, as that would contribute to strengthening international peace and security. My delegation further reaffirms the validity and importance and the need for the full and effective implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat

and Eradication the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Malaysia is of the view that the Programme of Action will promote and facilitate international cooperation, which will enhance the effectiveness and complement existing bilateral, regional and international agreements to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects. In that regard, we see the upcoming fifth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action as an important forum where confidence-building measures can be deliberated and consensually agreed upon.

On that note, my delegation expresses its hope for a results-oriented UNDC session in 2014. We call on all Member States to rejuvenate our negotiations in order to move forward on substantive matters towards a successful conclusion.

I would like to conclude by reaffirming Malaysia's support to you, Sir, and to the other members of the Bureau at this session.

Ms. Paik Ji-ah (Republic of Korea): I would like to join other speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. I am sure your able leadership will guide us in our deliberations for the next three weeks and enable us to achieve a fruitful outcome. I assure you of my delegation's full support. I would also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election and express our gratitude to the outgoing Chair, Ambassador Christopher Grima of Malta. And I thank Deputy Secretary-General Eliasson for his participation and remarks this morning (see A/CN.10/PV.337).

The Disarmament Commission is at a critical juncture. Delegations have expressed concerns and worries about the Commission's long-time failure to produce any recommendations. Another failure to achieve a meaningful outcome this year, and simply extend the three-year cycle, would endanger its raison d'être and undermine the credibility and authority of the multilateral disarmament machinery of the United Nations. In that regard, my delegation suggests that for the next three weeks delegations focus more on common denominators than on differences. The outcomes may not satisfy all Member States, but an incremental agreement would be better than none. Above all, progress is what the Commission urgently needs. To that end, the Republic of Korea looks forward to seeing a spirit of cooperation and compromise and an exhibition of political will on the part of all Member States.

The Republic of Korea believes that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to be the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and a key element of the international security architecture. In that context, discussion should be based on a balanced approach to the Treaty's three pillars and contribute to strengthening the NPT regime, including its universality. As such, it is important for all Member States to implement practical measures, as outlined in the action plan of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We look forward to a fruitful discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference. At the same time, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the start of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty are two urgent and much-overdue tasks that can be delayed no longer.

As the host of the 2012 second Nuclear Security Summit, in Seoul, the Republic of Korea sought a world without nuclear weapons. We welcome the successful third Nuclear Security Summit, held in The Hague last month, and the adoption of the Hague communiqué. In that regard, my delegation would like to recall the four-point proposal presented by President Park Geun-hye of the Republic of Korea in her address at The Hague. The points are, first, requiring a holistic approach that promotes synergy among nuclear security, nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation; secondly, pursuing a regional dialogue mechanism; thirdly, overcoming the capacity gap among States; and, fourthly, taking steps to tackle the emerging threat of cyber-terrorism against nuclear facilities. Although these serve mainly to advance the nuclear security architecture, they are also the areas we should keep in mind in discussing our agenda.

With regard to confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, we should exploit the unique momentum achieved recently. The overwhelming support of the General Assembly last year, as well as the rapid increase in ratifications of the Arms Trade Treaty, speaks to the international community's broad support for it. We look forward to its early entry into force. Together with the successful outcome of the United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme

of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, we expect that it will have a positive impact on the Commission's deliberations.

It is evident that the work of the Disarmament Commission cannot proceed independently of the overall nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation situation across the international community. Against that backdrop, we have witnessed both positive and negative developments. We see positive trends in the negotiation between the 5+1 group and Iran. Although there are many pending issues of concern to address if long-term solutions are to be achieved, we consider that negotiations are moving in the right direction.

On the other hand, the North Korean nuclear issue continues to pose a grave threat to the Korean peninsula, the region and beyond, as well as a serious and immediate challenge to the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Over the years, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has announced its withdrawal from the NPT, launched ballistic missiles ranging from short- to long-range, and conducted three nuclear tests. In recent weeks, it has launched a series of short- and medium-range ballistic missiles, in violation of the relevant Security Council resolutions, and is even publicly threatening another nuclear test. The Republic of Korea remains fully committed to realizing the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a peaceful manner and in close cooperation with the international community. We urge the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to immediately stop such provocations and to abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes, including its uranium enrichment, in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner, in compliance with its international obligations, including those under Security Council resolutions.

I would like to conclude by reiterating the sincere hope that the Disarmament Commission will emerge from its prolonged impasse and once again play a unique role in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. It is a task that requires our collective wisdom and a shared sense of responsibility for our future. We look forward to a fruitful outcome at the end of this session.

Mr. Zhang Junan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair for this session of the Disarmament Commission. The Chinese delegation will cooperate fully with you and other delegations in order to contribute to our efforts to achieve substantive progress at this session.

The world today is undergoing profound and complex changes. Countries are increasingly interdependent and linked by growing common interests. We believe the international community should adopt a new concept of security based on mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, and should work together to address our diverse security challenges and settle disputes by diplomatic and peaceful means, in order to create a peaceful and stable international and regional security environment conducive to the promotion of a multilateral arms-control and non-proliferation process.

As a nuclear-weapon State, China has earnestly pursued an open, transparent and responsible nuclear policy. At the Nuclear Security Summit held in The Hague a few days ago, His Excellency Mr. Xi Jinping, President of the People's Republic of China, made a statement for the first time on China's approach to nuclear security, at the core of which is an equal emphasis on development and security, on rights and obligations, on independent and collaborative efforts and on treating symptoms and addressing causes. He also made a solemn vow that China would stay firmly committed to strengthening its own nuclear security capability, building the international nuclear security system, supporting international cooperation on nuclear security and upholding regional and global peace and stability. He thus fully demonstrated China's commitment as a responsible country in the area of significant international security issues and underlined its important role in improving global nuclear security standards and achieving enduring nuclear security.

China stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons, and has always maintained its own nuclear forces at the minimum level necessary for its national security needs. We have exercised the utmost restraint in the development of nuclear weapons. China has adhered firmly to a nuclear strategy of self-defence and a policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances. It is unequivocally and unconditionally committed to a policy of no-use or threat-of-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or in nuclear-weapon-free zones, and it has always respected and supported the efforts of relevant countries and regions to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones.

China supports the principles and goals of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and remains committed to the nuclear-test moratorium.

China hopes that the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva will be able to reach consensus on its programme of work at an early date so as to start its substantive work as soon as possible, including the conclusion of a non-discriminatory and multilateral fissile material cut-off treaty with an effective international verification process.

China has been actively participating in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) review process. Together with other nuclear-weapon States, China has held a series of conferences on the implementation of the achievements of the NPT review process. The fifth round of the P-5 conference on the implementation of the NPT will be held on 14 and 15 April in Beijing. In addition, the P-5 working group on glossary and definitions for key nuclear terms, chaired by China, has held two expert meetings in Beijing. The working group will endeavour to submit its outcome to the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT.

China is of the view that international nuclear disarmament should follow the principles of maintaining global strategic stability and undiminished security for all. The countries with the largest nuclear arsenals bear special and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament, and should continue to make drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear arsenals in a verifiable and irreversible manner.

The development of missile defence systems, which undermines global security, strategic balance and stability, should be suspended. To achieve the ultimate goal of complete and thorough nuclear disarmament, the international community should develop, at an appropriate time, a viable and long-term plan composed of phased actions, including the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

China firmly opposes any form of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and promotes peaceful solutions to regional nuclear issues through dialogue and negotiations, with a view to upholding the international nuclear non-proliferation regime and maintaining international and regional peace and security.

China is committed to achieving the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and safeguarding the peace and stability of the peninsula and North-East Asia. China will continue to make efforts to urge all parties to resolve their concerns through dialogue in a balanced manner and ease the current situation and will commit to promoting the resumption of the Six-Party Talks.

China has been actively participating in the diplomatic efforts to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue through dialogue and negotiations. Under the joint efforts made by the P5+1 group and Iran, there has been a substantial achievement on the negotiation of the Iranian nuclear issue, namely the first-step agreement. China also made a voluntary contribution of RMB 1.5 million to the International Atomic Energy Agency for its safeguards work in Iran implementing the above-mentioned agreement. Another round of P5+1 talks with Iran is now under way, and China has already proposed five principles for a comprehensive settlement of the Iranian nuclear issue and has played a constructive role in facilitating the dialogue process. It is China's hope that all the relevant parties will help the substantive negotiations to succeed and seek a comprehensive, long-term and appropriate solution to the Iranian nuclear issue in a step-by-step manner.

China has always supported the establishment of practical and feasible confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms control and has made continuous efforts on promoting the related international and regional disarmament process and exploration of confidence-building measures.

China supports the necessary adjustments to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in line with the development of the international and regional security situation, while taking into account the concerns of all parties. The priority now is to improve the coverage of the Register, that is, to increase the number of participating countries.

China attaches great importance to the fight against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. China has adopted a series of measures on legislation, law enforcement, capacity building, international exchanges and cooperation and is actively preparing to submit a new national implementation report of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. China participated in the Security Council high-level meeting on small arms and light weapons held in September 2013 (see S/PV.7036) in a constructive manner and made four proposals to combat the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

China supports the international community taking the necessary measures to regulate the international trade in conventional arms and to combat the illicit transfer and trafficking of conventional arms. China participated constructively in the negotiation of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). China is currently studying the issue of signing the ATT. China attaches importance to the humanitarian issues caused by the illicit trade of conventional arms and is ready to strengthen cooperation with all parties with a view to building a regulated and reasonable arms trade order.

The current multilateral disarmament machinery, including the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, has made a tremendous contribution to safeguarding world peace and promoting the arms control process over the past decades. As the unique deliberative body of the machinery, the Commission has played an important role in setting the priority agenda for multilateral disarmament negotiations. China hopes that Member States view the role and status of the Commission from a rational and practical perspective and will conduct their work in a pragmatic manner so as to make positive progress at this session.

Mr. AlAjmi (Kuwait) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to chair the Disarmament Commission at its 2014 substantive session. We also congratulate the other members of the Bureau. We are certain that your capabilities and experience will contribute to the success of this session, to furthering the Commission's purposes and to formulating recommendations that reflect the concerns of all Member States.

My delegation would like to express its support for the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/CN.10/PV.337).

My delegation emphasizes the major role and increasing importance of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. The Disarmament Commission is considered one of the main, effective pillars of such diplomacy, since it is the only multilateral deliberative body specializing in submitting recommendations relating to the important issues listed on its agenda.

The Commission is meeting today as part of its 2014 substantive session. We hope that this will create a new situation that will restore the Commission's previous standing through the adoption of recommendations related to disarmament, non-proliferation and international security. It is our hope that all participating delegations at this session will work on creating a new situation that will restore the Commission's previous agenda.

In connection with the agenda item entitled "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", many multilateral and international efforts have been made over seven decades to contain the danger of that destructive category of weapons. That issue was also at the forefront of the United Nations priorities and was embodied in the declared goals of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament in 1978. However, the outcome of that session have to date not had any results that positively reflect on the multilateral disarmament mechanisms, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, which has been stalemated for almost two decades, or the Disarmament Commission itself, which for 14 years has failed to reach consensus on the many issues relating to disarmament and non-proliferation on its agenda.

Regional and subregional entities have a central role to play in guaranteeing the success of any international efforts that seek to create a better world, one that enjoys peace and security, by strengthening the frameworks of cooperation among States. In that respect, the zones free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction have played a pivotal role in supporting international efforts to create a world free of such weapons.

Nevertheless, the Middle East region is still far from achieving that noble goal. Indeed, despite the resolution adopted at the 1995 NPT Review Conference and the consensus decision contained in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference calling for the convening of a conference in 2012 to establish a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, that conference did not take place. In addition, Kuwait calls for the holding of such a conference as soon as possible, with all countries of the region participating, including Israel, without preconditions. We also emphasize the need for Israel to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and subject all of its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Kuwait welcomes the initiative of the Arab Republic of Egypt submitted to the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly containing practical measures towards establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. That initiative has garnered the support of all Arab States and the Islamic Republic of Iran through official letters addressed to the Secretary-General, pursuant to their legal and moral commitment to the resolutions adopted during NPT Review Conferences.

Kuwait welcomes the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 68/32 entitled "Follow-up to the 2013 high-level meeting of the General Assembly on nuclear disarmament", which was held on the margins of the sixty-eighth session.

With respect to the second item on the Commission's agenda, "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons", we would note the important role played by the guidelines in defining confidence-building measures that should be implemented on the regional and international levels. Such measures will have a concrete impact on regional and international peace and security, on transparency and on the willingness to share points of view. We would also like to highlight that such measures should take into account the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, such as non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, the equality and sovereignty of all States, the importance of refraining from the use or the threat of the use of force against the territorial integrity of any State, the inalienable rights of peoples under occupation to self-determination, the rejection of foreign occupation, the right of States to political independence and territorial integrity, and the fact that States should not occupy the territory of others.

My delegation cannot but remind the Commission of the importance of cooperation and the provision of technical and financial assistance with regard to confidence-building measures, pursuant to international treaties and conventions, including the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects or the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

Lastly, we hope that this year we will develop recommendations that have been sorely needed. We hope that all delegations will take part with sufficient political will to see the United Nations purposes of disarmament and non-proliferation, as embodied in the purposes and principles of the Charter, succeed.

Mr. Umemoto (Japan): At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair of the United Nations Disarmament Commission (UNDC), as well as the members of the UNDC Bureau upon their election. I assure you, Mr. Chair, and the members of the Bureau, that you have the full support and cooperation of my delegation.

The UNDC was once renowned as the leading deliberative United Nations body in the field of disarmament, while the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva was established as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum. However, both bodies have failed to fulfil their mandates.

Although the UNDC has in the past adopted 16 consensus documents on guidelines and recommendations, including the well-known guidelines for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, the Commission has remained in deadlock for nearly 15 years now. This year, the final year of the current three-year cycle, the States Members of the United Nations are supposed to come up with a consensus document that will guide us to further disarmament. Japan will actively contribute to the results of this year's substantive session, but the lack of yet another substantive outcome at the UNDC will seriously put the Commission's raison d'être into question.

I would now like to mention another challenge to international efforts in the disarmament and non-proliferation field. Despite the repeated adoption of Security Council resolutions on the nuclear and missile activities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the international disarmament and non-proliferation regime based on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) continues to face serious challenges, including numerous cases of outright violations. In that context, the recent ballistic missile launches conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are clear violations of Security Council resolutions and should be condemned.

In January of this year, the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Fumio Kishida, delivered a speech in Nagasaki on Japan's nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation policy. In his address, Minister Kishida explained that nuclear disarmament and

non-proliferation efforts should be built upon the following two notions. First, we should have a clear understanding of the humanitarian aspect of nuclear weapons as a point of departure for those efforts. Secondly, we should objectively assess the reality that the international community of today is facing in terms of the increasingly diverse nuclear risks. From those two understandings, we conclude that steady but tireless efforts to build up practical and concrete measures are actually the shortest path to achieving our common goal.

Political engagement is indispensable to the success of our efforts. Accordingly, 12 cross-regional members of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI), including my own country, are committed to the group's activities at the ministerial level. The NPDI is an action-oriented group that has put forward such concrete proposals as the draft standard reporting form on nuclear weapons transparency.

In a few days' time, on 11 and 12 April, Foreign Ministers of the NPDI member countries will meet in Hiroshima. During the course of the meeting, Japan intends to have the Ministers directly see and feel the realities caused by the bombings. Participants will exchange views on various issues, including nuclear disarmament in the post New START agreement era and its increased transparency, de-alerting, humanitarian aspects, a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and nuclear security. The Ministers will aim to present useful proposals for the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference, which will begin later this month in New York.

As the only country ever to have suffered from nuclear bombings, Japan understands the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that result from them. As a result, Japan has sought to proactively contribute to discussions on the issue. I would like to reiterate that in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation efforts, a clear understanding of humanitarian consequences caused by the use of nuclear weapons should underpin all efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. In other words, the humanitarian aspect of disarmament should function as a driving force in our efforts to reach a world free of nuclear weapons in a manner that is inclusive and open to all States.

In 2015, we will commemorate the seventieth year since atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is my sincere desire that the steady implementation of practical and effective disarmament measures, including through the substantive work of the 2015 NPT Review Conference, will achieve a step forward towards a world free of nuclear weapons. I invite all colleagues to visit the permanent exhibition on the atomic bombings in this United Nations building.

Addressing the enormous damage caused by conventional arms continues to be of the utmost importance to the international community. That is the area where United Nations leadership is needed. Japan has been supportive of the greater role of the United Nations in that field since we proposed the establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. In that regard, I would like to refer to two significant challenges that States Members of the United Nations must face in the coming months.

First, the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and its opening for signature mark a significant milestone for the world. Now the challenge ahead is to make the Treaty a reality through its early entry into force. Japan signed the Treaty on 3 June last year, the date opened for its signing. We submitted the Treaty to the National Diet last January in the determination to conclude it at the earliest date. In particular, the conclusion by the principal arms trade countries is essential. Japan would like to reiterate its call to those countries that have not yet done so to sign the Treaty without delay and to make the utmost efforts for its conclusion. As one of the original co-author States of the resolution that began the ATT process, Japan will continue to work hard with other Governments and civil society in order to achieve the early entry into force and effective implementation of the Treaty.

Secondly, the fifth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action on Small Arms will provide an important opportunity to advance efforts by the United Nations to tackle the enduring problem of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. On the basis of the agreement reached at the successful 2012 Review Conference on the Programme of Action, we are expected to deepen our discussion on preventative measures on stockpile management, marking and tracing, as well as international cooperation and assistance. Japan highly commends Ambassador Tanin, Chair-designate of the fifth Biennial Meeting, for the transparent and efficient manner in which he has been conducting preparatory work towards the Conference in June. Japan will

continue to be engaged actively in its work towards the successful outcome at that Meeting.

Despite the lack of progress in the United Nations disarmament machinery, there is still hope. For example, the Group of Governmental Experts on a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, established by resolution 67/53, in 2012, began its substantive work last week in Geneva and is currently in the middle of its first session. I am quite confident that, upon the completion of its two years of work in 2015, the Group will produce substantive recommendations that will significantly contribute to future negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty once such negotiations commence.

If the UNDC is to have a positive impact on the United Nations disarmament machinery, including through the Group of Governmental Experts, surely now is the time for it to reclaim its mandate and deliberate with a view to producing beneficial guidelines and recommendations. Supported by substantial human and financial resources, the expectations for the UNDC to produce results are rightfully high. Providing all the support that it can to the Chair, Japan will endeavour to ensure that this final year of the three-year cycle leads to a positive outcome.

Mr. Al-Sudairy (Saudi Arabia) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation is pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption as Chair of the Commission. It is a testament to your personal qualifications and to the high esteem in which your country, Croatia, is held. We are confident of your abilities and effective leadership in making our deliberations a success. We should also like to express our appreciation for the efforts of the Office for Disarmament Affairs in preparing for this meeting.

In that context, my Government wishes to reaffirm the concerns expressed in the report, in particular with regard to the establishment of a free-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, an idea that was adopted by the General Assembly in 1974 in resolution 3263 (XXIX), as well as an issue that has been adopted by consensus since the thirty-fifth of the General Assembly in 1980. It is a fact that peace and security can be achieved not through the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, but through cooperation and communication among States that seek to achieve development and progress and to prevent the acquisition of those terrible weapons.

Israel's possession of nuclear weapons is therefore a fundamental obstacle to the achievement of security and stability in the Middle East region. Consequently, all justifications used by Israel for its possession of nuclear weapons and the development of weapons of mass destruction are a flagrant contradiction to its claims that it seeks to achieve peace among the States of the region.

Genuine peace must be based on trust and sincere intentions among the States and peoples of the region, without oppression or heinous crimes. Clearly, peace cannot be achieved through the possession of nuclear weapons and the threat of using them. The imposition of the reality on the ground, namely, hegemony, will be a source of concern and threat not only to the peoples of the region but also to international peace and security.

My Government hopes that Iran will continue on the path of cooperation with the P5+1 group and on a positive track towards security and stability in the Arab Gulf. That is part and parcel of international security and stability. We always bear in mind that all States have the right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, in accordance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Peace and stability in the region and beyond, throughout the world, can be achieved not by possessing weapons but through cooperation, understanding and respect for the rights of others and non-hegemonic policies, as well as by working for the sake of the community of nations rather than for narrow self-interest. The phased reduction of nuclear weapons is a positive step in ensuring a promising future for humankind.

Through your chairmanship of the Commission, Sir, after much delay, Member States express the hope that we will achieve what we have long awaited, namely, the implementation of the the Working Group's recommendations on the elimination of nuclear weapons and their non-proliferation. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as Chair of Working Group I, will do its utmost to ensure that the report is issued with the cooperation of all our colleagues in the group. It will be issued following two years of discussions, which led to the issuance of two documents last year. We are now about to issue a new document, which may provide a reasonable basis for an adoption in the coming few days. If that were to be achieved, please accept in advance the expression of my gratitude, to you, Mr. Chair, and to my colleagues, the members of other delegations.

In conclusion, the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would like to reiterate that the elimination of nuclear weapons provides the guarantee that they will never be used either as a threat or as an actual weapon. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia believes that the fears and concerns of States that do not possess nuclear weapons must be taken seriously in the light of the continuous instability in the Middle East and the escalating dangers we have witnessed lately. That may be achieved through an international binding instrument that guarantees the safety and stability of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Tangible steps must be taken to build trust and enhance the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

Mr. Pankin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our full written statement is being circulated, and I will therefore focus on a just a couple of points.

The Russian Federation has consistently advocated strengthening the central role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security, arms control, enhancing non-proliferation regimes and genuine disarmament. We actively support the work of the multilateral disarmament triad: the First Committee of the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament. Together with our partners, we are ready to take stock of our substantive discussions in the framework of the Disarmament Commission, whose three-year cycle is coming to an end.

A world free of the threat of the use of weapons of mass destruction is one of the key elements for strengthening international security and strategic stability. Russia is making an important contribution to achieving that goal by strictly adhering to its obligations under bilateral and multilateral disarmament agreements, including strict compliance with the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. Further steps of the Russian Federation in the field of nuclear disarmament are only possible with the implementation of that Treaty.

We are also committed to our obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Bearing that in mind, the Russian Federation calls upon all States to consistently move towards creating the conditions for the phased achievement of the strategic goal of building a world free of nuclear weapons.

A reduction and limitation of nuclear weapons cannot be achieved without due regard for all the factors affecting strategic stability. In our opinion, those factors are the unilateral and unjustified build-up of the United States global missile defence system, the lack of any substantive progress in the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the United States unwillingness to renounce the possibility of placing weapons in outer space and the build-up of quantitative and qualitative imbalances in the field of conventional weapons and others.

We call on all countries of the world to unite and strengthen their efforts to establish the conditions that will make it possible to take further steps towards nuclear disarmament while strengthening stability and equal and indivisible security for all. We consider counterproductive any attempt to distract the international community by introducing certain artificially created issues such as the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. The Russian Federation understands the serious consequences of using of nuclear weapons and will continue make every possible effort to avoid that.

With regard to preventing threats to the non-proliferation regime, one of the main goals is to increase international cooperation to ensure that non-State actors, in particular terrorists, do not gain access to nuclear materials and related technologies. We would also like to emphasize the need to hold a conference as early as possible, with the participation of all States of the Middle East, on the issue of establishing a zone in the region free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

We cannot allow outer space to become a new area of military confrontation and potential theatre of war. It is necessary to develop as quickly as possible a legally binding international treaty to prevent the deployment of weapons in outer space. The main thrust of such a treaty, which is reflected in the relevant Russian-Chinese draft text, is supported by the overwhelming majority of the members of the international community. We call on all States to follow our example and to commit themselves to a policy of no-first-placement of weapons in outer space.

During the sixty-ninth session of the General Assembly, the Russian Federation will introduce a

draft resolution on no-first-placement of weapons in outer space. We expect broad sponsorship for that draft resolution and for it to be adopted by consensus.

At that forum, the Russian Federation plans to develop a draft document, a kind of food-for-thought, on increasing transparency and confidence-building measures in the area of conventional weapons with a particular focus on preventing the deployment of weapons in outer space. We invite all interested States to support that document and join the ranks of its sponsors.

In the modern world, transparency and confidence-building measures are becoming increasingly important. I would like to underscore that, at the sixty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the First Committee adopted by consensus a draft resolution on transparency and confidence-building measures with unprecedented sponsorship, including by the Russian Federation, China and the United States, as well as 67 other States.

Russia will also seek to bring the conventional arms control regimes in balance, as well as to ensure unconditional observance by all States of agreed confidence-building and security measures.

With regard to small arms and light weapons, Russia considers black markets to be the main threat, as they provide terrorists, extremists, illegal armed groups, members of organized and street crime with weapons that fuel all kinds of conflicts. Tangible results in curbing their proliferation will increase substantially if concrete measures are taken to prevent those weapons from falling into the hands of those who use them for criminal purposes.

With regard to transparency, we think that the main task of the relevant mechanisms, including the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, is to monitor the destabilizing accumulation of conventional weapons in order to foster effective dialogue among States to address the concerns they may have.

I would like to assure the Commission that the Russian delegation is ready to constructively cooperate with all interested States to work productively, based on consensus, during the 2014 session of the Disarmament Commission.

In conclusion, allow me to just say a few words with regard to the issue of the so-called violations by Russia of the Budapest Memorandum of 1994, which was raised at this morning's meeting (see A/CN.10/PV.337) by my Ukrainian colleague. My delegation considers it essential to make the following statement. The current Government in Kyiv, which came to power as the result of an unconstitutional coup, has, through its policy on national minorities in particular, in essence undermined Ukraine's unity by pushing an entire region out Ukraine.

Neither at the summit of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) held in Budapest in 1994 nor in measures adopted in parallel with that conference did Russia take on the obligation to force a part of Ukraine to remain in that country against the will of its people. The provisions of the Budapest Memorandum do not apply to conditions that occurred as a result of internal political or economic factors. As is well known, 97 per cent of all those who voted in the referendum in Crimea on 16 March, which took place under the control of international observers, voted in favour of joining the Russian Federation, leading thus to Ukraine's loss of its territorial integrity. It was the result of very complex internal processes with which Russia, pursuant to its obligations under the Budapest Memorandum, has no connection.

The Russian Federation has strictly complied, and continues to comply, with its obligations under the Budapest Memorandum in respect of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, including in the light of the clashes at Maidan. That cannot be said of some Western Powers, which have neglected their obligations. I just want to recall that in Budapest, in addition to the Memorandum, a joint statement was issued by the leaders of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Ukraine that emphasized the importance of obligations in the framework of the OSCE to combat an increase in chauvinist and nationalist trends. Ukraine did not fulfil those obligations. For many years, it did nothing to stop the rising nationalism and chauvinism that contributed to Crimea's decision to join the Russian Federation.

As for statements to the effect that the Russian Federation is demonstrating that negative security assurances by nuclear-weapon States are not reliable and that it is supposedly undermining nuclear disarmament, we note that an important element of the Budapest Memorandum and the concept of negative security assurances is the obligation not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Russia has in no way violated that obligation towards Ukraine. All the other obligations under the

Budapest Memorandum reiterate OSCE principles and have no connection to the concept of negative security assurances or negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Statements that Russia supposedly undermines the nuclear non-proliferation regime are not justified or made in good faith.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): On behalf of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, I would like, first of all, to congratulate you, Mr. Chair, on your assumption of the Chair, as well as the other members of the Bureau on their election. I hope that, under your able leadership and chairmanship, Sir, the current session will be crowned with success.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia, who spoke on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries (see A/CN.10/PV.337). We also highly appreciate Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson's opening remarks.

With the current session, we are entering the third year of discussions on drafting recommendations on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Recently, we the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement made a collective effort and presented constructive proposals that included realistic ideas and views in favour of nuclear disarmament to be reflected in the recommendations. As today's stark reality clearly indicates, nuclear disarmament remains at a difficult impasse. The country that developed the most powerful weapon in the world, and even used it against the civilian population of two large cities, thus committing massive crimes of genocide — the country that is sitting on the largest stockpiles of nuclear weapons in the world — is hell-bent on modernizing its nuclear weapons, being unsatisfied with its current stockpiles.

The modernization of nuclear weapons by that country has nothing to do with international peace and security; it is merely the product of anachronistic and outdated policies of projecting strength and an unrealizable dream of hegemony over the world. That country continues to advertise a so-called vision of a world free of nuclear weapons, which is both hypocritical and deceptive and designed to cover up its efforts at modernizing its nuclear weapons.

Pushing ahead with its nuclear weapons programme and global missile defence system development despite the serious concerns of the international community is having a negative impact on the strategic balance of the world, advancing the strategic interests of the other nuclear-weapon States and giving rise to an increasingly intense nuclear arms race. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is adamant in its position and stance, which are consistent in their support for the total elimination of all nuclear weapons in existence. We believe that such an end can be achieved only when the largest nuclear-weapon State takes a practical leading role in bringing about nuclear disarmament, halts the modernization of its nuclear weapons programme and stops its development of a missile defence system.

With respect to the grave situation on the Korean peninsula, it is clear that the United States hostile policy of nuclear blackmail is reaching an extreme point. Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would like to clarify its position as follows.

First, the United States should stop its joint military drills with South Korea, for they are tantamount to nuclear blackmail against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As far as the joint military drills are concerned, in their essence and core, they are a very dangerous war game for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aimed as they are at swallowing up our country and occupying the entire Korean peninsula. It is the therefore the most extreme form of policy of hostility against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Coming into the year 2014, in order to safeguard our national peace and security and create conditions and a climate conducive to opening a dialogue, easing tensions and improving North-South relations, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea National Defence Commission advanced crucial proposals calling for the halting of hostile military actions between the two Koreas as a key element. Later, in the follow-up, through the generous efforts of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, there was an opening of dialogue and an easing of tensions that was warmly welcomed by the international community. Only the United States brazenly ignored our crucial proposals to stop the mobilization of nuclear weapons in its military drills. Rather, it openly declared to the world that it would not change its policy towards the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It would continue to conduct military drills with South Korea, as planned. Then, the United States, by entering into joint military drills despite the serious concern of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and all fellow

Korean countrymen in North-East Asia and the Asia-Pacific region, did not hestitate to start the drills and even to fly nuclear-weapon-carrying B-52 strategic bombers into South Korea, while North Korea and South Korea were sitting together at the dialogue table.

Furthermore, the United States did not hesitate to enter into the joint military drills just when the reunion of separated families was successfully being held, despite the objections of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the request from the South Korean authorities with regard to that issue. The families were experiencing the feeling of very warm and friendly blood-relation kinship in Mount Kumgang-san. On the pretext of the joint military drills coordinating the Foal Eagle exercise, the United States has now established a massive arms build-up in South Korea with the deployment of nuclear-weapon-carrying nuclear-powered submarines, destroyers carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles and equipped with the most sophisticated Aegis system and all other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. As part of the exercise, the United States and South Korea conducted a massive landing exercise in South Korea. That exercise was the largest ever since 1993. The United States openly declared that it was targeted at the occupation of Pyongyang.

Secondly, the United States should stop misleading the world with false rumours about the so-called provocation and threats by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with regard to its very righteous and just self-defence countermeasures against the joint military drills and blackmail of nuclear weapons.

As everyone knows, recently, the strategic forces of the Korean People's Army of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea conducted planned and routine rocket launch exercises in response again to the ongoing and ever-escalating tension and joint military drills of the United States. It was therefore more than a justifiable self-defence measure in exercise of the right to self-defence as a State Member of the United Nations. However, the United States raised the issue at the Security Council, manipulated the adoption of so-called elements and condemned the rocket launches by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a violation of the resolutions.

As everyone knows, by opening the joint military drills, the United States has escalated the situation. Now it is now implicating our self-defence measures as provocative military actions. That is further provocation. The United States is creating such tension in order to sustain a vicious cycle of tension in the Korean peninsula, to block the process of denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and to creat a pretext to maintain outdated military alliance and military presence in North-East Asia.

As far as its legal commitments are concerned, the United States made a commitment to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the bilateral agreements under, first, the Agreed Framework between the United States of America and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea of October 1994, secondly, the Washington, D.C., Joint Communiqué between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States of October 2000, and, thirdly, the joint statements of 15 September 1995 and of February 2012. The United States made a commitment not to impose a hostile policy on or to undertake nuclear blackmail against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. However, it has overturned all those commitments and listed the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as part of the axis of evil and as a target for a pre-emptive nuclear weapon strike. Now it conducts joint military drills every year.

The question now arises when the United States enters the territory of another country across the ocean, far from its land, opening aggressive and provocative military drills on our doorstep and calling it routine and annual. But when we exercise the right to self-defence, the United States calls it provocation and a threat. That is a typical and gangster-like American-style expression of its policy. It is very unique to and very popular with the United States in today's world.

As everyone clearly knows, the escalation of tension on the Korean peninsula has been created by the United States. The provocation comes from the United States. The situation on the Korean peninsula is driven and master-minded by the United States.

As long as the United States continues to bring all the various means for a nuclear strike into the Korean peinsula under the pretext of its joint nuclear war exercises, it is natural for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take self-defence countermeasures to strengthen its nuclear deterrent force and its power on Earth.

Thus far in my statement, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has drawn attention to nuclear blackmail by the United States of one country for more than six decades. We express the

hope that this meeting will pay due attention to that very grave situation. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea affirms that it will closely cooperate with the efforts of members participating in the meeting.

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will continue its efforts towards the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula but such efforts will be purely in order to put an end to the nuclear blackmail of our country.

Ms. Mejía Vélez (Colombia); Allow me to join so many before me in congratulating you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the current session.

(*spoke in Spanish*)

Allow me to share the fact that Colombia, with its long-standing dedication to peace, its respect for international law and its firm commitment to disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which are basic principles of its foreign policy, has taken an active part in all international forums that deal with this issue of such fundamental universal interest. We have also helped to seek agreements that preserve the goal that inspired the establishment of the United Nations and that respect its purposes and principles by supporting initiatives to free the world from the threat posed by nuclear weapons and by participating in the main legal instruments in that area.

In our capacity as a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Colombia has always stressed the importance of the effective implementation of the three pillars of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, namely, disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the promotion of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. In that context, we are of the view that the framework of the NPT, both through its provisions and its Review Conferences, has established action plans for advancing nuclear disarmament. That is why, for the next Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to be held in 2015, we emphasize the importance of achieving meaningful progress in fully complying with our obligations under the Treaty, particularly those specified in article VI, concerning the total elimination of this type of weapon, particularly bearing in mind the threat to humankind posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and their possible use or threat of use, as has been noted at the first and second International Conferences on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, held, respectively in Norway in 2013 and Mexico City in 2014.

Colombia is a party to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean — the Treaty of Tlatelolco, as it is well known — whereby the region became the first area of the planet to be definitively without nuclear weapons and with a population free of their influence, representing an invaluable step for us towards peace. In that context, Colombia once again urges that nuclear-weapon-free zones be established as a contribution to international peace and security. We would also like to express our concern about the possible proliferation of nuclear weapons among non-State actors, which is why we urge countries to comply with their obligations under Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), whose significance lies in the fact that it complements the existing binding instruments on disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As a result, with support from the Inter-American Committee against Terrorism and in compliance with post-1540 decisions, Colombia has developed a national plan of action to strengthen its ability to ensure the effective implementation of the resolution on its territory. I would like to take this opportunity to invite States and organizations able to do so to support us.

As the Commission is aware, conventional weapons are responsible for the majority of fatalities worldwide. It is these arms that sustain criminal behaviour and violent situations that damage development and cause severe humanitarian problems. The illicit trade in small arms, ammunition and explosives is a scourge that contributes to other issues such as the global drug problem, which my country suffers from, terrorism and transnational organized crime. As a representative of my country, which is fully conscious of the terrible consequences of the illicit arms trade, I welcomed the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty, which celebrated its first anniversary on 2 April, just a few days ago. We are pleased that so far 118 States have signed the Treaty and 30 have ratified it. My Government is currently presenting the text of the Treaty to our national Congress, and we hope that by June we will have become one of the first 50 States to ratify it.

When it comes to the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, ammunition and explosives, we States will be able to tackle it only if we act quickly, cooperatively and in a coordinated way. We hope that

the second Review Conference of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, along with the preparations for the fifth Biennial Meeting of States parties to consider the implementation of the Programme and the International Tracing Instrument, which will take place in New York from 16 to 20 June, will provide an opportunity to make major progress in this area. As we have done in the past, Colombia, together with South Africa and Japan, sponsored resolution 68/48, entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects", which highlighted how important it is that States intensify their efforts to build their national capacity for effectively implementing the Programme of Action.

For Colombia and its entire region, every effort in the area of disarmament and the non-proliferation of conventional weapons should be backed by measures aimed at building confidence, transparency and ongoing dialogue. During the second Summit of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC), which took place in Havana and was attended by some of those here and presided over by our neighbour Costa Rica, Colombia supported the proposal of El Salvador for a special declaration on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects in Latin America and the Caribbean. CELAC's Heads of State and Government agreed to establish a working group to consider illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons and their ammunition. In Havana, in the presence of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, we also introduced a proposal for a mechanism and procedures that would enable us to coordinate efforts in this area, based on full respect for international law and the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Colombia believes that confidence-building measures are an effective way to promote international cooperation in encouraging exchanges of experiences and developing and maintaining best practices in disarmament and non-proliferation in our region, as we did when, while presiding as Secretary-General over the Union of South American Nations, we took the opportunity to produce a South American register of military spending and a standardized methodology for presenting its annual report. This is a historic step forward for a region such as South America; the register has become part of the United Nations Register of Conventional Weapons, and we believe that its transparency makes it an enormously useful tool for our Governments.

Colombia, as a State committed to the major international instruments regulating weapons with humanitarian impact, including the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and the Convention on Cluster Munitions, works actively to promote and implement them, with special emphasis on applying a comprehensive focus on protecting and helpint the victims of such weapons. A few days ago, in this very room, we commemorated the International Day of Mine Awareness and Assistance in Mine Action, together with Japan, and listened to a recital of statistics that we are not proud of. We have the world's second-largest number of victims of anti-personnel mines, due to non-State armed actors whose activities have created obstacles to Colombia's social and economic development. Nonetheless, we are firmly committed to the full elimination of such weapons. We are working with the United Nations Mine Action Service and hope that one result of our continuing and persistent struggle to deal with these issues will be our accumulation of valuable and significant experience that we can offer to States parties to the Convention, which will enable us to contribute to world peace and security, to which we are so firmly committed. We will continue to offer such cooperation to countries that need it.

I thank you, Mr. Chair, for this opportunity to reaffirm my country's commitment to general disarmament and non-proliferation.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker in the general exchange of views today. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. In that connection, I would like to remind delegations that the number of interventions in exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting is limited to two. The first intervention should be limited to 10 minutes, and the second to 5 minutes.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): At this afternoon's meeting, the representatives of South Korea and Japan made reference to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, touching upon several issues. Since I have already addressed several of them in my main statement, I will not respond to every issue in this right of reply. There are, however, two things I would like to mention.

First, the representative of South Korea talked about the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's nuclear weapon denuclearization. As I said in my main statement, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea National Defence Commission advanced crucial proposals for national security and peace on the Korean peninsula. One of the key proposals contained therein was on the issue of not allowing external nuclear strike means to enter the territory of the Korean peninsula — not to allow external nuclear weapons onto the land of the Korean peninsula — which embodies and reflects the desire for denuclearization on the part of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and of the entire Korean nation.

In my main statement, I also drew the Commission's attention to the issue of over six decades' long nuclear threats against the Korean nation and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In 1957, the Government of the United States introduced the first nuclear weapon into South Korea, and had increased their number to more than 1,000 by the 1970s. In addition, every year, under the pretext of joint drills, as I said, they are escalating tensions with nuclear weapons coming into the land, through B-52s strategic bombers, nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers. They are bringing everything they have to support the means for making a nuclear strike.

Moreover, South Korea is under the nuclear umbrella of the United States. It is very contradictory — while they are under the nuclear umbrella of the United States to protect them from their fellow countrymen, they continue to call for the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Nobody understands the logic behind that. While they are allowing a foreign country's nuclear weapons onto their territory, they do not want their fellow countrymen to possess their own nuclear weapons, which are aimed at safeguarding the national peace and security of all their fellow countrymen, and of the region and the world as a whole. I therefore recommend that South Korea carefully study the background of the origin of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

Secondly, rocket launches and supposed missile launches are an issue that has drawn the attention of the delegations. On 23 March, South Korea launched ballistic missiles with a range of 500 kilometres, which they kept secret. After 10 days, they made the launch public. If we consider the date that the United States raised the issue of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea missile launch in the Security Council — 28 March — it is not hard to imagine how it can do that: double standards.

Indeed, the United States has a very strange double standard criteria with respect to nuclear and missile proliferation. When the country in question is an ally of the United States, for example Israel or South Korea, it is encouraged to have nuclear weapons, in order to increase the range of rocket launches. But when the country in question is an enemy or is not aligned with United States policy, straightaway it becomes an issue that is raised in the Security Council.

That gives rise to a question. Why did the United States raise the issue of the rocket launch of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's in the Security Council on 28 March yet remain silent about South Korea's launch five days earlier?

Mr. Lim Sang Beom (Republic of Korea): With regard to the statement made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, I would like to exercise my right of reply in response to his arguments.

First of all, North Korea has been under sanctions of the Security Council due to its nuclear tests and launches of long-range ballistic missiles in defiance of international norms. The relevant Security Council resolutions, such as resolutions 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013) and 2094 (2013), clearly stipulate that North Korea shall not conduct any further launches that use ballistic missile technology. Therefore, the recent ballistic missile launches by North Korea are flagrant violations of Security Council resolutions, as we stated at the time. In contrast, our recent missile test was conducted in full compliance with international norms. North Korea's argument is therefore groundless and unfounded.

Regarding the joint Republic of Korea/United States military exercises, I would like to state the following. The joint exercises have been conducted annually for several decades and are purely defensive in nature. They are designed to enhance our combined readiness against North Korea's military provocations and threats. The exercises have contributed to the deterrence of war on the Korean peninsula. The United Nations Command Military Armistice Commission has notified North Korea every year in advance of the exercise with the date and the fact that it is defensive in nature as well as the fact that the exercise is not in

response to the current security situation on the Korean peninsula. In addition, the exercise has been conducted with the supervision of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission. North Korea has annually issued a trite and inflammatory statement on the joint exercise even though it also conducts its own annual winter exercises at the national level.

Furthermore, with respect to the assertion by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that a nuclear arsenal is being brought into Korea, we would respond by stating that there are no nuclear weapons within our territory. It remains our unchanged policy to observe and implement the 1992 Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, to which North Korea is also party.

Finally, I would like to mention that, pursuant to the relevant Security Council resolutions and the Joint Statement dated 19 September 2005, North Korea is obligated to abandon all nuclear weapons and its existing nuclear programme, including its uranium enrichment programme. The most recently adopted Security Council resolution on this issue, resolution 2094 (2013), made that obligation even clearer. North Korea should clearly understand that it cannot obtain anything by developing its nuclear programme.

Mr. Ri Tong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I have listened again to the clumsy and ridiculous arguments of the representative of South Korea, which do not make sense and lack logic. They brought in nuclear weapons from the United States in 1957. They have 1,000 nuclear weapons on Korean territory. Is there any country that would allow this kind of stockpiling of nuclear weapons against one nation for more than six decades? South Korea is the only country that allows weapons from outside in its territory, and which are a threat to the survival of the Korean community as a nation.

This is a question for South Korea that I want an answer on from its representative. The resolution concerned is illegal and very clumsy, and once again was manipulated by the United States. The United States never raised the issue of South Korea's uranium enrichment, which was disclosed several times. It never raised the issue of Israel's nuclear weapons with the Security Council. It singled out the Democratic People's Republic of Korea alone. It even made an issue of a satellite launch by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is a matter of everyday practice for peaceful purposes.

Two years ago we launched a satellite in an open and transparent manner, notifying all neighbouring countries and international organizations. We even invited reporters from the international mass media. We were more transparent than anybody. But the United States again raised the issue with the Security Council and adopted the resolution to which the representative of South Korea referred. That is totally illegal. Our satellite launch was conducted as a sovereign State's full exercise of its right to legitimate space activities. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a State party to the Outer Space Treaty, an international multilateral treaty. After the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's launch in December 2012, South Korea launched a satellite. That was not raised with the Security Council. Japan launched one. That was not raised.

Again, all of that shows the United States double standards and abuse of power — a so-called responsible, permanent member of the Security Council that is interested only in its own selfish political and strategic interests, thereby undermining the credibility of the United Nations and the Security Council, whose mission is to maintain international peace and security.

Concerning the issue of the joint military drills, he again made another ridiculous and routine argument. This is going on right now. The international community is watching this exercise closely. It is escalating tension in the Korean peninsula, creating a response from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and it is being raised with the Security Council as an act of provocation. Why are they not being reported to the Security Council? The United States should be number one on the list for being reported to the Security Council.

Mr. Lim Sang Beom (Republic of Korea): I would like to make some clarifications regarding the accusations made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Our position is clear — the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy is reserved for countries that faithfully implement their obligations under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and within the regime established by the Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). North Korea, which withdrew from the NPT and conducted nuclear tests in violation of Security Council resolutions, is not entitled to such a right.

Regarding the right to peaceful uses of outer space, I would like to make it clear that Security Council resolutions — for example, resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009) — have stipulated that North Korea is not entitled to any launch using ballistic missile technology. North Korea resorted to sophistry and continued with its violations. As a result, the Council was obliged to further spell out in a presidential statement in April 2012 (S/PRST/2012/13) that North Korea's launches were serious violations of the relevant Security Council resolutions, even when they were characterized as satellite launch or space launch vehicles.

The representative of North Korea has repeatedly said that his country categorically rejects the Security Council's resolutions, and that it is not bound by any of those obligations. I would like to make it clear that according to Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations, all Member States agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council. Furthermore, Article 48, paragraph 1, states that the action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations. According to Chapter VII of the Charter, all Members — which includes the Democratic People's Republic of Korea — must carry out their obligations in accordance with Security Council resolutions. Article 4 of the Charter clearly restricts membership of the United Nations to peace-loving States that accept and carry out their obligations. North Korea cannot accept one while rejecting the other.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.